Article

Armed Forces & Society
2016, Vol. 42(1) 192-210

DOI: 10.1177/0095327X14545507
afs.sagepub.com
SAGE

Environmental Problems and Surge in Civil–Military Cooperation: The Case of the Botswana Defense Force

Anastassia Bugday[1]

Abstract

Problems associated with environment and climate change have long been in the headlines. However, research on the effects that such problems might have on civil–military relations has been limited so far. This article examines civil–military cooperation caused by environmental problems in the recent decades particularly in developing countries. It employs Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux's theoretical framework on military missions and civilian control and then looks at the case of Botswana. This article argues that the recent decade has seen an increase in civil–military cooperation due to new security concerns over environmental problems.

Keywords

civil–military cooperation, civilian control, environment, Botswana, new military missions

[1] Department of International Relations, Ihsan Dogramaci Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

Corresponding Author:
Anastassia Bugday, Department of International Relations, Ihsan Dogramaci Bilkent University, Bilkent, Ankara 06800, Turkey.
Email: boitsova@bilkent.edu.tr

Introduction

This article examines civil–military cooperation caused by environmental problems in Botswana in the recent decades. Today's environment has come to be regarded as a security threat, though the voices expressing this view had been heard before the end of the Cold War. Thus, in 1977, Lester Brown called for redefining national security to adjust it to the contemporary world. He argued that aside from military threats to national security, ecological stresses and resource scarcities that lead to economic and later political instabilities should also be considered.[1]

Today, environmental problems are not only widely discussed in terms of their connection to conflicts[2] but are also accepted as security issues[3] and are presented in national security strategy articles.[4] This research was encouraged by the following questions: does environmental degradation affect civil–military relations (CMR)? What are the views of the military on this issue? How do environmental problems affect CMR in developing countries and in particular, can they increase civil–military cooperation? Finally, what are the implications of this transformation for democracy?

In this article, I argue that civil–military cooperation on nontraditional issues such as the environment depends on effective civilian control. Accordingly, after the literature review section, I utilize Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux's 2000 theoretical framework on military missions and civilian control to show that use of the military in nontraditional missions does not preclude civilian control. Hence, I add to this argument by demonstrating through the case of Botswana that the use of the military in environmental missions leads to the surge in civil–military cooperation once civilian control is in place. Finally, I conclude with implications of civil–military cooperation due to environmental issues for Botswana's democracy.

Literature Review

The research questions of this article focus on civil–military cooperation in developing democracies. However, it is not always possible to expect an efficient civilian control of the military in an immature democracy. In his seminal book, *The Soldier and the State*, Samuel Huntington elaborates on the concept of "civilian control." Important for the purposes of this essay is Huntington's view on the participation of the military in politics or the "antithesis of objective civilian control."[5] In Huntington's view, the more professional the military becomes, the less involved it is in politics.

Alfred Stepan, on the contrary, argues that a professional military can become increasingly politicized. He calls this dynamic "the new professionalism." Within this framework, the military establishment is increasingly involved in internal security issues, and this phenomenon is not only confined to developing countries.[6] Similar to Stepan, Claude Welch argues that the roles that the military assumes affect its political involvement, with neutrality being possible under the conditions of long

periods of internal tranquility, which is a rather rare phenomenon in Third World countries.[7]

An abundance of empirical cases illustrates Stepan and Welch's arguments, namely that the military has diverged from its traditionally assumed responsibility of defending the state from external enemies to nontraditional missions inside the state. For example, in light of increased participation of the European Union's (EU) armed forces in diverse operations, including peacekeeping, Timothy Edmunds asks the following question: what are the armed forces for? According to him, since the end of the Cold War in 1991, a profound shift occurred in states' perception of military roles. This was because after the collapse of the bipolar system and the US–Soviet rivalry, internal conflicts and civil wars came to the fore. Further reassessment of contemporary military roles was caused by the September 11 terrorist attacks, and the consequent "War on Terror," followed by the invasion of Iraq. New security challenges compelled the EU governments to use their armed forces for diverse internal security purposes, including assisting local law enforcement during national disasters.

Edmunds sums up two problems associated with the use of the military for internal security purposes. First, consistent with Stepan's arguments, Edmunds points out that involving the armed forces in domestic issues may increase the risk of politicizing it, raising the probability of its intervention in domestic matters. Second, the use of the military in nontraditional roles inevitably brings the question of its appropriateness and efficiency for fulfilling these tasks. The emulation of these new roles by the military itself is a way of justifying its budget, not to mention its very existence.[8]

A good illustration of this point is a study conducted by Emmanuel Ojo on the use of Nigerian military in civil conflict resolution in Bayelsa, Benue, and Taraba states in Nigeria. He argues that a prolonged military rule in Nigeria has militarized the society, which resulted in the military's frequent use for nontraditional missions. Ojo similarly comes to the conclusion of the inappropriateness of military as an institution for resolving civil conflicts due to its particular training or lack thereof.[9]

The debate over civil control of the military received a further impetus after the end of the Cold War. Michael Desch's study on *Soldiers, States, and Structures*[10] defines civilian control of the military with respect to the location and the intensity of threats. According to the system, the environment with high internal and low external threats would be the worst for the establishment of the civilian control, while the conditions of low internal and high external threats are optimal for civilian control of the military.[11]

Studies directly tackling the environmental issues and the military argue against the use of the military in environmental protection. Geoffrey Dabelko and P. J. Simmons, for instance, assert that engaging the military in nontraditional roles would decrease its operational readiness.[12] Matthias Finger, on the other hand, discusses the military as a possible solution to the problem of environmental pollution, not a cause. Global militarization, he argues, would lead to the conditions in which environmental crises could only be addressed through crisis management, with the

military as a useful tool. However, this would lead to increased pollution from military activities, creating a vicious circle.[13]

Jon Barnett recently put forward another view on this topic, arguing that problems associated with environmental change have been militarized, with the emphasis having been placed on:

> environmental change as cause of violent conflict rather than human insecurity; and on exogenous environmental threats to the state for which unspecified others were seen to be responsible, as opposed to attending to domestic causes of environmental change.[14]

Apart from the literature that focuses on the use of the military for the protection of environment in domestic setting, a parallel discussion touches upon the possible use of the military to secure environmental protection in other states. Robyn Eckersley argues that this subject is worth exploring for at least two reasons. First, there are still imminent environmental threats, which national governments are unable to effectively deal with. Second, viewed from this perspective the concepts of sovereignty, nonintervention, and environmental norms come once again under scrutiny. Eckersley concludes that despite the fact that "eco-humanitarian intervention," like humanitarian intervention itself, is still "particularly shaky on the question of political legitimacy, especially from the point of view of many developing countries,"[15] the morality of such interventions cannot be completely dismissed, reaching now a point "where extending the idea of 'responsibility to protect' to include biological diversity is no longer unthinkable."[16]

Overall, the literature on the engagement of the military in environmental protection or other similar missions is still scarce; particularly essential for further research would be case studies on such military activities outside their traditional roles, especially in developing countries.

Theoretical Framework

This article utilizes the framework proposed by David Pion-Berlin and Craig Arceneaux in their 2000 article in *Armed Forces & Society*.[17] The scholars pose the question of whether some military activities are more difficult to supervise than others, and thus a threat to civilian control. The authors look at the scope and location of military missions and operations, and the level of civilian control over them. Their research, conducted through an extensive search and analysis of both newspaper sources and legal documents, challenged the commonly held assumptions regarding different levels of civilian control over diverse missions and operations. Table 1 summarizes two tables presented by Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, with missions in italics added by this author for the purposes of this article. It combines the tables on the scope and location of missions/operations and the conventional expectations on the level of civilian control, respectively.

Table 1. Location of Mission/Operation—Scope of Mission/Operation (*Conventional* Expectations Regarding the Level of Civilian Control).[1]

External-restrictive (high)	External-expansive (medium)
National defense, international peacekeeping	Humanitarian relief abroad, electoral supervision
Border development, security	Drug interdiction, migration control
Internal-restrictive (medium)	Internal-expansive (low)
Counterinsurgency, arms manufacturing	Crime control, antisubversion, civic action, disaster relief
	Environmental protection
	Environmental security operations

Note: This table has been taken from Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, "Decision-Makers or Decision-Takers?" 413-36. It represents a simplified combination of two tables compiled by Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, and includes additional missions in italics added by the author.

As shown previously, the location of the missions refers to whether the missions are conducted outside the nation (external) or inside it (internal). In addition, the restrictive scope of the mission means the military is called to use its professional skills, while expansive refers to situations where the military must apply transferable skills in order to deal with problems outside combat.[18] Variables in brackets indicate the conventional wisdom on the level of civilian control in the respective missions/operations.

This article looks at the subject of civil–military cooperation as influenced by environmental problems with an eye on how environmental protection missions increase civil–military cooperation, especially in developing countries. This is a rather pristine area of research, and sources or studies to draw upon are limited. Nevertheless, there are studies that examine civil–military cooperation and they also assume preexistence of civilian control. For example, Rebecca Schiff argues that the military, the political elites, and the citizenry should strive for a cooperative relationship in strategic situations such as foreign policy, counterinsurgency, and military strategy. This relationship does not have to involve a separation of the three above-mentioned actors. Schiff's concordance theory points to the "high level of integration between the military and other parts of society as one of several types of civil-military relationship."[19] Schiff later on introduces the concept of targeted partnership. She argues that targeted partnership involves reciprocity between the military, the political elites, and the citizenry. This reciprocity is established for a limited time period in order to reach a specific objective.[20] Hence, Schiff's argument, although useful, is rather limited to elaborate on how environmental issues affect civilian control and consequently increase civil–military cooperation.

Although there is research on how militaries' involvement in relief activities during national disasters increases civil–military cooperation,[21] little attention is paid to the environment and how it affects CMR. Thus, this article examines how environmental problems affect CMR in the South African state of Botswana. Moreover, this

study builds on Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux's provocative finding that contrary to the conventional wisdom shown previously, "political leaders achieve greater control more often over expansive operations (40% of the time) than over restrictive ones (26.7%)."[22] Following their lead, I also assume that "internally expansive missions do not pose inherent or insurmountable obstacles to either complete or partial civilian control"[23] and then trace the evidence of the surge in civil–military cooperation in a developing country due to environmental issues. In this vein, I assume that civilian control is a precondition of successful civil–military cooperation.

The choice of looking at a developing country located in sub-Saharan Africa has been stimulated by the author's interest in this geographical area. In addition, not many studies so far have been published on the subject of recent surge in cooperation in CMR in the states of this particular region.

The next section first examines the environment and its relationship to the military in other states in order to show the diversity of military attitudes toward the environmental issues compared to Botswana.

Placing the Case of Botswana in International Context

Botswana is not the only state in which environmental problems have caught the attention of national militaries: the United States, the United Kingdom, Turkey, Sweden and Finland, Latvia, and India are just several other examples. Taking a brief look at them provides a general picture of what developed and developing states face in this area.

Governmental officials and the military in both United States and United Kingdom extensively emphasized the threat for peace caused by environmental problems and climate change. On May 2, 2012, while speaking at the annual reception for the Environmental Defense Fund at the Renwick Gallery in Washington, DC, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta underlined climate and environmental change as emerging national security threats,[24] echoing the sentiments of British colleagues several years before.[25]

Some militaries are now also concerned with the long- and short-term effects of environmental problems on their soldiers stationed abroad, as well as the local population.[26] In 2008, the military establishments of the Unites States, Sweden and Finland, compiled an *Environmental Guidebook for Military Operations*, with an aim of "proactively reduc[ing] the environmental impacts of military operations, and protect[ing] the health and safety of deployed forces."[27] These three defense organizations agreed that any "[f]ailure to integrate environmental considerations into operational- and tactical-level planning increases the risk to the health and safety of military personnel and civilian non-combatants."[28] In addition, quite recently, the US military has come under increasing pressure for leaving behind hazard toxic waste in Iraq, although the military itself argues that its activities, including the cleanup is being conducted according to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines.[29]

In the United States, the domestic pollution problem has also become increasingly sensitive, particularly in 1990s when President Clinton's appointee to the Department of Defense as deputy undersecretary of defense for environmental security, Sherri Wasserman Goodman launched an offensive to green the US military. Goodman's initiative, among others, aimed at promoting civilian control of the military in areas previously run by the military itself. Robert Durant summarizes the situation as follows:

> Goodman wanted all environmental security positions not required for military command or deployment converted to civilian positions. In the process, of course, the services would no longer control the career prospects of civilian ENR personnel in their charge, and base commanders would lose effective control over the environmental funding and issues affecting operations on their bases.[30]

Throughout the initial phase of "greening" of the US military since the Cold War's end, the military has made numerous attempts to retain control over their own environmentally relevant activities, including military waste disposal, cleaning up of military sites, preventing pollution, and greening the weapons systems.[31] In the competition over spheres of influence, the military has been largely successful. To achieve its goals, the military used different tactics, including delays, "committee shopping," conducting its own environmental assessment, underreporting, as well as arguing that money spent on such programs decreased the funding available for defense spending.[32]

Thus, in the domestic arena, the US military faced the difficulty that its own activities were causing pollution. In fact, the US Army and US Navy were found to be 2 of the 100 major polluters in the United States.[33] Such a situation caused some to question whether the military is actually protecting the civilians while it produces toxic waste and then fails to either clean it up, or transfer the control of this area to civilians (although recent developments show the military slowly giving in). As such, the 2004 new "green" procurement policy of the Department of Defense called upon both its civilian and military personnel to purchase services and products that benefit the environment.[34]

In addition, the fact that new types of missions could potentially foster cooperation between the military and the nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) was already emphasized in 2007. Linton Wells and Charles Hauss argue that the deployment by the US Navy of the carrier *Abraham Lincoln* and the hospital ship *Mercy* to Indonesia in the aftermath of the 2004 tsunami in Asia had two consequences. First, both the military and the NGOs realized they could work together for a common purpose; and second, that "the U.S. military has capacities that no other organization in the world can match."[35] It is quite encouraging that such a capable organization is becoming more willing to cooperate with the civilians in solving environmental problems.

Another example of the current trend to rethink the connection between environmental pollution and the military is revealed by the case of Latvia. A recent report

prepared by the Latvian Ministry of Defense shows the preoccupation with environmental pollution of the soil on many military bases formerly used by the Soviet troops stationed there prior to Latvian independence. The report points to the absence of relevant legislation and management plans to cope with the problem and puts forward the major objectives of the Latvian Government and National Armed Forces in connection to solving this issue, including an increase in civil–military cooperation, such as working with national environmental protection institutions and authorities, as well as ensuring the provision of training through environment-educated managers at all command levels of the Latvian Armed Forces.[36]

In the case of India, a retired major general of the Indian Army, Eustace D'Souza, discusses the potential use of the Indian army for environmental protection. He argues that although the military establishment has been acknowledged as a powerful force in politics and economy, the positive role that the military can play in "protecting and restoring our degraded environment"[37] is not usually acknowledged. D'Souza states that following the consultations between the government and the Ministry of Defense and Environment, the so-called Eco Territorial Army Battalions were raised in order to deal exclusively with environmental protection. Their successful missions include prevention of desertification and soil erosion, introduction of antipollution measures, increasing the awareness of the issue among local population, as well as planting trees on mass scale. D'Souza concludes that the army has an important role to play in environmental protection due to its "virtues," particularly its "organizational structure, training, leadership, motivation, technical skills, mobility and intercommunications."[38]

These are just several examples of military engagement to grapple with environmental degradation, but all these cases reveal a slowly changing mind-set in terms of how environmental concerns affect CMR in the more developed world by increasing civil–military cooperation. The following section focuses on the Botswana military and its attitude toward environmental problems, and the subsequent increase in civil–military cooperation in this country.

Civil–Military Cooperation in the Case of the Botswana Defense Force (BDF)

Botswana is a landlocked African country that gained its independence from the United Kingdom in 1966. It has extensive borders with South Africa, Namibia, and Zimbabwe, and a short border area with Zambia to the North. Botswana is usually referred to as an African success story, due to the absence of coups d'état, and devastating civil wars that plagued the continent in the twentieth and the beginning of twenty-first centuries.[39] Apart from political stability, Botswana managed to transform itself from one of the poorest states in the world to one with a per capita gross domestic product (GDP) of US$16,300 as of 2011[40] (compared to US$1,600 in neighboring Zambia for the same period).[41]

The discovery of gem diamonds in Botswana in early 1970s, provided stimulus for economic development, and today this sector amounts to about one-third of the country's GDP and around half of the government revenues.[42] Still, the diamond industry is only a small employer compared to agriculture and tourist trade, the largest and second largest employers in the country, respectively.[43] Further, wildlife plays an important role in Botswana's economic development, and tourism associated with it is considered one of key sectors contributing to governmental revenues. Thus, Botswana's commitment to environmental protection is not surprising and epitomizes the recent redefinition of what "security" means worldwide.

A consequence of this redefinition of "security" has been the assignment to military institutions new nontraditional missions. A good example is the BDF and its involvement in public education of the Botswana society regarding the HIV and AIDS. Many Batswana work in South Africa, or in the affiliates of South African companies located in Botswana;[44] and as South Africa has been one of the hardest hit nations by the HIV/AIDS epidemic, with over six million people living with the virus,[45] it makes the Batswana all the more vulnerable to this disease. The BDF's involvement in public education on this manner was caused by several factors, including reduction in its strength and undermining of its capability to protect the state, as it draws its ranks directly from the Botswana population.[46] Due to HIV/AIDS becoming a serious threat to Botswana society in general and the military in particular, the BDF found itself distanced from its traditional roles by being involved in a private sphere through its public education program. Environment and its protection are another such areas, which saw similar trend.

A significant component of wildlife protection is Botswana's antipoaching operations. According to Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux's framework, BDF antipoaching operations would fall into the internal expansive mission category with moderate to high levels of civilian control (30.8 percent each)[47] established most of the time. These missions have been largely successful, which is extraordinary given the fact that at the start of military involvement in environmental protection missions, there was no successful precedent that the BDF could have emulated or built its activities upon. Prior domestic deployments of African militaries on the continent included examples of Zimbabwe and Zambia. Both countries at around the same time (1980s) tried to fight poaching activities on their soil using their national armies; both proved unsuccessful, however. In the case of Zimbabwe, the military encountered a vast network of commercial poaching and had to withdraw; and in the case of Zambia, the military proved inefficient in its antipoaching role.[48]

According to the Constitution, the President of Botswana is the commander in chief and has the power not only to assign military posts but also to deploy the Botswana military without prior consultation with any institution. These arrangements accord the executive branch almost exclusive control over the military, a power successive presidents have used to assign the BDF to crime-fighting and antipoaching missions over a long period of time.[49]

Along with the creation of the BDF in 1977, Botswana Parliament established a Defence Council with a mission of "control, direction and general superintendence of the Defence Force." The President appointed its members, who currently consist of legislators and cabinet officials.[50] The supervisory ministry in the case of Botswana is the office of the President. In practice, however, the military oversees itself.[51] Still, the military in Botswana closely follows the Western notion of CMR. Dan Henk underlines the "almost ritualized acknowledgement of the importance of military subordination to civil authority,"[52] with military seeing its missions as an "aid to civil authority"[53] and itself as "apolitical servants of state."[54]

The BDF antipoaching missions affected its relationship with both civilian population and police, and other governmental institutions. Since its inception in 1977[55] through the beginning of its antipoaching operations in 1987, the BDF's credibility with the local population has risen and then fallen due to its inability to prevent neighboring states from violating Botswana's sovereignty, starting with Rhodesia. This resulted in the Lesoma incident in 1978, in which BDF forces drove directly into a Rhodesian ambush, resulting in the deaths of fifteen Botswana soldiers.[56] Later came the intervention of the South African Defense Forces, leading to, among others, the destruction of the Mapoka village.[57] There were even calls from university students to disband the BDF.[58] Thus, their newly assigned mission was a capability test for the BDF. One of the major questions was whether the BDF would be able to protect local populations, some of whom were not only adversely affected by BDF's inability to curb violent incursion in Botswana's territory, forcing them to flee their homes, but also by armed poachers who in addition to Botswana's animals, "preyed on the country's ordinary citizens."[59]

BDF's Relationship with Botswana's Population

The main challenge in relationship with the local population was for the BDF to convince in word and action that it was able to protect them from heavily armed gangs of poachers. The fact that poachers carry guns is still highlighted in news on the BDF operations. Thus, in one recent case, when two Namibian nationals were killed during an antipoaching operation, the Government of Botswana issued a statement that the poachers were carrying "a loaded 12 Gauge Shot Gun (serial No. 108466) made in Russia, and a loaded, 22 caliber rifles with telescopic sights (serial No. B195401) and a knife."[60]

BDF put much effort into convincing the general public that it was a professional organization that "does not abuse the rights of citizens."[61] BDF has relied on, what Henk calls, good publicity to enhance its image, particularly its participation in anticrime patrols in cities that "reduced the level of violent crime."[62] One important example here is Operation Provide Comfort[63] that started in 1994 in Gaborone.

Of particular importance for the success of BDF's missions was establishing and maintaining close relationships with the local population that reside next to wildlife reserves, as in Maun, Kasane and Shakawe. Today, the BDF not only maintains its

presence in the region but has also been involved in humanitarian missions, such as rescue operations during the floods in 1995, 1996, 2006, and 2009.[64]

In addition, BDF is highly involved in water management, ranging from participating in seminars on this topic to digging wells and providing potable water to the local population. BDF's Corps of Engineers also provide "water purifying machines and water trailers in support of civil authorities" when drastic water unavailability has been caused either by flooding or by shortages.[65] Henk indicates that Botswana public shares a view that antipoaching missions kept its military busy in a good way. The missions represented "a tangible return on the national investment in an army that was otherwise 'unoccupied'."[66]

BDF's Relationship with the Botswana Police and Other Institutions

Employing the BDF in types of missions that are not usually assigned to national armies had a transformative effect on the relationship between the Botswana military and Botswana police as well as the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP). At first, the lack of any precedent for cooperative relationship, caused frictions on the following five levels: personal jealousies, competing agendas, similarity in responsibilities, legal ambiguities, and most importantly overlapping jurisdiction.[67]

Since colonial times, the DWNP has been responsible for the protection of Botswana's wildlife. However, in the 1980s, neither police nor DWNP were able to deter poaching activities on Botswana's soil. In comparison with the poachers, both institutions were very poorly equipped and inadequately trained. When the BDF started its operations, Botswana police did not know how to legally evaluate the death of a poacher during the mission. Their first reaction was to consider it a homicide that included conducting investigations, interrogating BDF soldiers who participated in the operation and even considering those soldiers "murder suspects." Police forces also confiscated all the material found on poachers as evidence in the case. There were also occasions where senior military leadership was forced to get involved in disputes between the officers and the policemen.[68]

Frequently during the early stages of the BDF antipoaching operations, military–police relations suffered due to the absence of a legal framework. For example, after poachers were killed, the police would arrive at the scene and consider each killed poacher as a homicide. The BDF soldiers would then be considered murder suspects and interrogated as such. The military, who were assigned to the mission by the President of Botswana himself, regarded their own actions as legitimate and honorable. At times the conflict reached such proportions that the leadership of the Botswana military, Ian Khama in particular, had to intervene in order to mediate between the military and the police.[69] However, both sides eventually managed to establish a cooperative relationship. According to Henk,

> police ultimately conceded that BDF employment of lethal force against poachers should not be subject to police investigation, nor would the police demand as evidence the matériel left after a firefight. By the mid-1990s, the working relationship had become so much smoother and less bureaucratic that at least some of BDF antipoaching patrols included members of the police.[70]

Henk acquired information regarding this transformation of the relationship between the BDF and the police through extensive interviews with local officers.[71] It is possible to infer from Henk's findings that the most probable reasons for this surge in cooperation are the urgency of the environmental problem in Botswana, the inappropriateness of certain police procedures toward military antipoaching activities, and the requirement of extensive time periods for such investigations, which would have bogged down the BDF operations.

The BDF was also forced to establish a new relationship with the DWNP, which had a constitutional responsibility to manage Botswana's wildlife. However, because the foreign poachers were so heavily armed, this agency could not effectively fight them. The solution was found in cooperation between the BDF and the DWNP under which the former provided military capabilities and did all the real fighting, while the latter provided a much-needed expertise.[72]

The success of this new relationship is shown by the fact that by 2006, all these agencies had established a joint committee in order to coordinate antipoaching missions countrywide. Both the Botswana police and the DWNP now took part in planning of the missions, and developed new strategies for tracking poachers, such as inserting chips into the horns of wild rhinos.[73] Recently, the poaching activity has been increasing in Africa in general, and Botswana in particular. As a result, the BDF and the DWNP have intensified the number of both foot and aerial patrols, followed by arrests of captured poachers.[74]

In 2011, Vince Crawley from US AFRICOM Public Affairs described the BDF as numbering "about 13,000 uniformed personnel, plus several lions, a couple of crocodiles, and a few hyenas and baboons. Not to mention the snakes."[75] During the course of its work, the BDF acquired some species of Botswana's wildlife, including lions. These were brought to the BDF's wildlife awareness facility at one of the military camps where the BDF soldiers have the firsthand experience in learning how to behave around and work in proximity of these creatures. For the BDF, such knowledge is of particular importance as its soldiers still spend many hours patrolling against poachers in wildlife reserves. To avoid dangerous situations, lions that became too familiar with people living next to their habitat and eager to enter their farms were also brought to the enclosures by the BDF.[76] Such activities show the determination of the BDF to perform their duties professionally and with minimum risk to wild fauna, its soldiers, and the local population.

BDF's antipoaching operations are also important for Botswana's wildlife, because it has the largest elephant population in Southern Africa with 133,829 elephants, though located on a territory of 100,265 km^2, four times smaller than the

range territory of Angola that hosts only 818 elephants.[77] Botswana's elephant population also increased at an approximate rate of 6,640 per year for the period between 2002 and 2007,[78] which could be attributed to successful civil–military cooperation tactics in preventing illegal poaching.

Conclusion and Implications: Civil–Military Cooperation in Environmental Issues and its Effect on Botswana's Democracy?

In this article, I argue that nontraditional issues such as the environment lead to a surge in civil–military cooperation in developing countries where civilian control is established. Through the case of Botswana, I tried to show how the military could be an effective tool of the civilians in tackling environmental problems. In conclusion, I examine the implications of this increasing civil–military cooperation for democracy in Botswana, the "oldest democracy in Africa"[79] with "regular free and fair parliamentary elections."[80]

Mpho G. Molomo argues that Botswana differs from other African countries because its military officers do not contest power through coercion; rather they turn to elections as a way of attaining governmental positions.[81] Ex-members of the military, particularly generals, turn to politics, including Ian Khama, a former commander of the BDF and the man behind the BDF's antipoaching operations, who served ten years as Vice-President and in 2008, became the President of the country. Yet, the public has never questioned the neutrality of these generals: their pursuit of careers and political affiliation was and still is considered to be their right as civilian Botswana citizens.[82] However, in another piece, Molomo maintains that the trend of retired generals earning governmental posts could prove dangerous in the long run as it could lead to the politicization of the military.[83]

In this vein, Lekoko Kenosi argues that in a democracy the military should ensure that it gains "public confidence, because a military that is not trusted by the population lacks legitimacy and will have difficulties justifying its expenses and even its existence."[84] As such, since the start of antipoaching operations the BDF has been engaged in active publicity, in order to convince Botswana's population of its professionalism and its ability to protect them from armed poachers. Moreover, BDF's continuous involvement in flood relief operations, including the provision of water, works in the direction of establishing trust among the population.

Still, the issue of military accountability remains problematic. In the case of the BDF and its antipoaching operations, it seems that the military was given considerable autonomy because of its capabilities and experience. Such autonomy does not necessarily contradict democratic practices as long as the military does not abuse its power. In fact, officers who acted as if they were above the law were tried and convicted in Botswana.[85]

The appropriateness of these missions outside of military's professional functions can also be questioned. Without a successful precedent to draw its experience from,

the BDF managed to deal well with the problem of poaching, establish cooperative relations with the Botswana police and the DWNP, as well as the respective institutions in the neighboring countries, allowing for a more efficient prevention, tracking, and/or ending illegal poaching mostly in the north of the country. However, the problem of poaching is as pressing as ever. The poachers are now even more militarized with "sophisticated weapons and tactics and can match regular armies pound for pound"[86] as a result of demobilization without integration of guerilla fighters in neighboring countries. These fighters took to poaching using their arms. According to a BDF Brigadier, these poachers "[m]ore than ever before, /. . . / are prepared to kill."[87]

Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux put forward three rules that have to be followed when judging the appropriateness of military missions outside their professional roles.[88] The first is that there is an absence of civilian capability to fulfill the operations. In light of how well armed the poachers are, the military appears to be the only organization capable of confronting them. Such civilian capability was also absent at the start of the operations in 1987. The second rule concerns the willingness of the military to pass the control to a civilian organization when such arises. That remains to be seen, though it is possible since the military views their missions as an aid to civilian authority. The final rule is that a government should try to create an effective civilian organization for resolving the problem. The success of the BDF in dealing with poaching, on the other hand, decreased the Botswana government's incentives for rehabilitating the DWNP,[89] which fosters continuous involvement of the BDF in internally expansive missions.

Overall, it is essential to question further the appropriateness of Botswana's military engagement in internally expansive missions such as environmental security operations. The fact that the BDF was first committed to these missions in 1987 and still remains the major institution to deal with poaching, as well as governmental lack of incentive to foster a civilian alternative, are alarming signals. Still, as the Botswana's case exemplifies, the involvement of the military in internally expansive environmental protection missions may increase civil–military cooperation and transform CMR in developing countries.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my doctoral supervisor Nil Satana for encouraging me to work on this topic, her support and invaluable comments during the whole process. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor David Pion-Berlin and three anonymous reviewers for their valuable insights, which helped substantially improve this article. The author would also like to acknowledge the support provided by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK), program number 2215. Yet, all errors remain the author's.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interests with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

Notes

1. Lester R. Brown, "Redefining National Security," *Worldwatch Paper* 14 (Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, 1977), 37.
2. See, for instance, Jean-Christophe Hoste and Koen Vlassenroot, "Climate Change and Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Mother of All Problems?" (paper presented at the International Symposium "Developing Countries Facing Global Warming: A Post-Kyoto Assessment" at the Royal Academy for Overseas Sciences, United Nations, Brussels, 2009).
3. On this issue, see also Jessica Tuchman Mathews, "Redefining Security," *Foreign Affairs* 68, 2 (1989): 162-77; Richard H. Ullman, "Redefining Security," *International Security* 8, 1 (1983): 129-53; Gregory D. Foster, "Environmental Security: The Search for Strategic Legitimacy," *Armed Forces & Society* 27, 3 (2001): 373-95.
4. See, for instance, White House, *National Security Strategy* (Washington, DC: White House, 2010).
5. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil–Military Relations* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957), 83.
6. Alfred Stepan, "The New Professionalism of Internal Warfare and Military Role Expansion," in *Authoritarian Brazil*, ed. Alfred Stepan (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973), 134.
7. Claude E. Welch, *No Farewell to Arms? Military Disengagement from Politics in Africa and Latin America* (London, UK: Westview Press, 1987).
8. Timothy Edmunds, "What Are Armed Forces For? The Changing Nature of Military Roles in Europe," *International Affairs* 82, 6 (2006): 1059-75.
9. Emmanuel O. Ojo, "New Missions and Roles of the Military Forces: The Blurring of Military and Police Roles in Nigeria," *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 11, 1 and 2 (2008/2009): 1-18.
10. Michael C. Desch, "Soldiers, States, and Structures: The End of the Cold War and Weakening U.S. Civilian Control," *Armed Forces & Society* 24, 3 (1998): 389-406.
11. Michael C. Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 116.
12. Geoffrey D. Dabelko and P. J. Simmons, "Environment and Security: Core Ideas and US Government Initiatives," *SAIS Review* 17, 1 (1997): 138.
13. Matthias Finger, "The Military, the Nation State and the Environment," *Resurgence & Ecologist* 21, 5 (1991): 225.
14. Jon Barnett, *The Meaning of Environmental Security: Ecological Politics and Policy in the New Security Era* (London, UK: Zed Books, 2001).
15. Robyn Eckersley, "Ecological Intervention: Prospects and Limits," *Ethics & International Affairs* 21, 3 (2007): 312.
16. Ibid.

17. David Pion-Berlin and Craig Arceneaux, "Decision-Makers or Decision-Takers? Military Missions and Civilian Control in Democratic South America," *Armed Forces & Society* 26, 3 (2000): 413-36.
18. Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, "Decision-Makers or Decision-Takers?" 413-36.
19. Rebecca L. Schiff, "Civil-Military Relations Reconsidered: A Theory of Concordance," *Armed Forces & Society* 22, 1 (1995): 7.
20. Rebecca L. Schiff, "Concordance Theory, Targeted Partnership and Counterinsurgency Strategy," *Armed Forces & Society* 38, 2 (2012): 318-39.
21. Nil S. Şatana, "Transformation of the Turkish Military and the Path to Democracy," *Armed Forces & Society* 34, 3 (2008): 369.
22. Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, "Decision-Makers or Decision-Takers?" 429.
23. Ibid., 430.
24. Nick Simeone, "Panetta: Environment Emerges as National Security Concern," *U.S. Department of Defense*, accessed December 1, 2012, http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=116192. See also Suzanne Goldenberg, "Pentagon to Rank Global Warming as Destabilising Force: US Defence Review Says Military Planners Should Factor Climate Change into Long-term Strategy," *The Guardian*, January 31, 2010, accessed December 1, 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jan/31/pentagon-ranks-global-warming-destabilising-force; Joshua Zaffos, "A Tour of the New Geopolitics of Global Warming," *Scientific American*, April 2, 2012, accessed December 2, 2012, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=the-new-geopolitics-of-global-warming.
25. Jeremy Elton Jacquot, "Get Ready for Global Warming Says British Armed Forces Head," accessed December 1, 2012, http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/get-ready-for-global-warming-says-british-armed-forces-head.html.
26. Ben Russell and Nigel Morris, "Armed Forces are Put on Standby to Tackle Threat of Wars over Water," *The Independent*, February 28, 2006, accessed September 20, 2012, http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/armed-forces-are-put-on-standby-to-tackle-threat-of-wars-over-water-467974.html.
27. *Environmental Guidebook for Military Operations*, accessed December 2, 2012, http://www.defmin.fi/files/1256/Guidebook_final_printing_version.pdf, iii.
28. Ibid.
29. Scott Peterson, "As Iraq War Winds Down, US Military Cleans up Hazardous Waste," *The Christian Science Monitor*, accessed December 2, 2012, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Europe/2010/0722/As-Iraq-war-winds-down-US-military-cleans-up-hazardous-waste.
30. Robert Durant, "Toxic Politics, Organizational Change, and the "Greening" of the U.S. Military: Toward a Polity-Centered Perspective," *Administration & Society* 39, 3 (2007): 434.
31. Durant, "Toxic Politics, Organizational Change, and the "Greening" of the U.S. Military," 424.
32. Ibid., 428-30, 435, 439.
33. Bruce Watson, "Cleaning Up the Toxic Legacy of Closed Military Bases," *Daily Finance*, accessed December 1, 2012, http://www.dailyfinance.com/2010/09/24/closed-military-bases-leave-a-toxic-legacy/.

34. Sgt. 1st Class Doug Sample, "DoD Issues 'Green' Procurement Policy to Benefit Environment," *U.S. Department of Defense*, accessed December 1, 2012, http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=25009.
35. Linton Wells and Charles Hauss, "Odd Couples: The DoD and NGOs," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40, 3 (2007): 485.
36. Andris Gulbis, "Latvian Approach to the Environmental Issues in the Military Area and Unexploded Ordnance," Ministry of Defence, International Relations Department, Multilateral Relations and International Organizations Division, accessed July 10, 2013, http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/p010595.pdf.
37. Eustace D'Souza, "The Potential of the Military in Environmental Protection: India," accessed on July 18, 2013, http://www.fao.org/docrep/v7850e/v7850e12.htm.
38. D'Souza, "The Potential of the Military in Environmental Protection."
39. McGowan's frequently cited double study on military coup's in sixteen West African states indicates that since independence and until 2004 these countries have witnessed "forty-four successful military-led coups, forty-three often-bloody failed coups, at least eighty-two coup plots, seven civil wars, and many other forms of political conflict." See Patrick J. McGowan, "Coups and Conflict in West Africa, 1955-2004: Part II, Empirical Findings," *Armed Forces & Society* 32, 2 (2006): 234-53.
40. Botswana, *CIA World Factbook*, accessed November 27, 2012, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/bc.html.
41. Zambia, *CIA World Factbook*, accessed November 27, 2012, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/za.html.
42. Botswana, *CIA World Factbook.*
43. Brent Bankus, "Environmental Security in Botswana," *Center for Strategic Leadership, U.S. Army War College*, 17, 11 (2011), accessed November 28, 2012, http://www.csl.army.mil/usacsl/publications/ip17_11.pdf.
44. Pete Lewis, Anne-Grete Larsen, Arne Groenningsaeter, Moses Galeboe, and Spambaniso Taneka, *Crossing Borders to Fight HIV/AIDS: The Role of South African Multinationals In The Private Sector Response in Botswana*, Fafo-report 431, 2003, accessed April 2, 2014, http://www.fafo.no/pub/rapp/431/431.pdf.
45. "South Africa: HIV and AIDS estimates (2012)," *UNAIDS*, accessed April 4, 2014, http://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/southafrica/.
46. Raymond Molatole and Steven Laki Thaga, "Interventions against HIV/AIDS in the Botswana Defence Force," in *The Enemy Within: Southern African Militaries' Quarter-century Battle with HIV and AIDS,* ed. Martin Rupiya (Pretoria, South Africa: Institute for Security Studies, 2006), 19-64.
47. Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, "Decision-makers or Decision-takers?" 429.
48. For Zimbabwe, see Dan Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force in the Struggle for an African Environment* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 111. For Zambia, see Clark Gibson, *Politicians and Poachers: The Political Economy of Wildlife Policy in Africa* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
49. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 94.

50. Defence Council, accessed July 14, 2013, http://www.gov.bw/en/Ministries–Authorities/Ministries/State-President/Office-of-the-President/Divisions/Defence-Council/.
51. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 98.
52. Dan Henk, "Biodiversity and the Military in Botswana," *Armed Forces & Society* 32, 2 (2006): 284.
53. Botswana Defense Force, "Aid to Civil Authority," accessed November 29, 2012, http://www.gov.bw/en/Ministries–Authorities/Ministries/State-President/Botswana-Defence-Force-BDF/Community-Relations1/Aid-to-Civil-Authority/.
54. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 105.
55. Dan Henk, "The Botswana Defence Force: Evolution of a Professional African Military," *African Security Review* 13, 4 (2004): 85-99.
56. "Lesoma Memorial Monument," accessed November 29, 2012, http://chobenationalpark.info/other-attractions/lesoma-memorial-monument/; "BDF Commemorates Lesoma Massacre," accessed November 29, 2012, http://www.dailynews.gov.bw/cgi-bin/news.cgi?d=20110412.
57. Lekoko Kenosi, "The Botswana Defence Force and Public Trust: The Military Dilemma in a Democracy," *Institute for Security Studies*, accessed December 2, 2012, http://www.iss.co.za/uploads/OURSELVESKENOSI.PDF, 190.
58. Kenosi, "The Botswana Defence Force and Public Trust," 2012.
59. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 49.
60. Botswana Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, "Media Reports on the Shooting Incident of Two Namibian Nationals," accessed November 30, 2012, http://www.mofaic.gov.bw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=744:bbbbbbbbbbbb&catid=7:news&Itemid=241.
61. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 105.
62. Ibid.
63. The name is the same as the 1991 military operation led by the United States and its allies to protect fleeing Kurds in northern Iraq, including the provision of humanitarian aid.
64. Botswana Defense Force, "Domestic & External Support Operations," accessed November 29, 2012, http://www.gov.bw/en/Ministries–Authorities/Ministries/State-President/Botswana-Defence-Force-BDF/Community Relations1/Duties-of-the-BDF/.
65. Bankus, "Environmental Security in Botswana," 2011.
66. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 58.
67. Ibid., 65.
68. Ibid., 66.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. Unfortunately, in his book, Henk does not provide the texts of those interviews, which makes it hard to assert the exact reason for the positive change between two organizations.
72. Ibid.; Dan Henk, "The Botswana Defense Force and the War Against Poachers in Southern Africa," *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 16, 2 (2005): 176.
73. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 67.

74. Mbongeni Mguni, "Poachers Plunder Wildlife … As 644 Animals Die in Five Years (Botswana)," *Save the Elephants*, Ele News, accessed July 12, 2013, http://www.savetheelephants.org/news-reader/items/poachers-plunder-wildlifeas-644-animals-die-in-five-years-40botswana41.html; "The Terrible Ill-fate of Bemwo," *Elephants Without Borders*, accessed June 28, 2013, http://elephantswithoutborders.org/blog/?p=1129.
75. Vince Crawley, "Botswana Troops Get Up Close and Personal with Wildlife before Anti-poaching Missions," U.S. Africa Command, accessed November 27, 2012, http://www.africom.mil/getArticle.asp?art=7422.
76. Ibid.
77. Elephant Database, *Angola, 2012 ("2013 AFRICA" analysis)*, accessed April 20, 2014, http://www.elephantdatabase.org/preview_report/2013_africa/Loxodonta_africana/2012/Africa/Southern_Africa/Angola.
78. J. J. Blanc, R. F. W. Barnes, G. C. Craig, H. T. Dublin, C. R. Thouless, I. Douglas-Hamilton, and J. A. Hart, *African Elephant Status Report 2007: An Update from the African Elephant Database*, accessed November 30, 2012, http://www.african-elephant.org/aed/aesr2007.html.
79. Kenosi, "The Botswana Defence Force and Public Trust," 189.
80. Henk, "Biodiversity and the Military in Botswana," 274.
81. Mpho G. Molomo, "Security Sector Reform in Botswana," accessed December 1, 2012, http://www.google.com.tr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=botswana%20defence%20force%20democracy&source=web&cd=5&cad=rja&ved=0CD8QFjAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.iiss.org%2FEasySiteWeb%2FGatewayLink.aspx%3FalId%3D20019&ei=pae8UJeCHoTTtAbH9IDACA&usg=AFQjCNHFvIElidGN2-xcX4S9vbQcBMcGmg, 12.
82. Kenosi, "The Botswana Defence Force and Public Trust," 197.
83. Mpho G. Molomo, "Civil-Military Relations in Botswana's Developmental State," *African Studies Quarterly* 5, 2 (2001), accessed July 15, 2013, http://web.africa.ufl.edu/asq/v5/v5i12a3.htm.
84. Kenosi, "The Botswana Defence Force and Public Trust," 189.
85. Ibid., 192-93.
86. "Inside Botswana's Cocktail of Poaching Militias, Security Moles and Chinese Handlers," *Sunday Standard*, accessed July 19, 2013, http://www.sundaystandard.info/article.php?NewsID=16163&GroupID=1.
87. Ibid.
88. Pion-Berlin and Arceneaux, "Decision-Makers or Decision-Takers?" 433.
89. Henk, *The Botswana Defense Force*, 2007, 148.

Author Biography

Anastassia Buğday is a PhD candidate and research assistant in the Department of International Relations at Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. Her current research interests are minority issues, instances of transnational terrorism in developing countries, and civil–military cooperation on environmental issues.